

Guidance for Industry and FDA Staff

Class II Special Controls Guidance Document: Automated Blood Cell Separator Device Operating by Centrifugal or Filtration Separation Principle

DRAFT GUIDANCE

This guidance document is being distributed for comment purposes only.

Submit comments on this draft document by the date provided in the *Federal Register* notice announcing the availability of the draft guidance. Submit comments to the Division of Dockets Management (HFA-305), Food and Drug Administration, 5630 Fishers Lane, rm. 1061, Rockville, MD 20852. You should identify all comments with the docket number listed in the notice of availability that publishes in the *Federal Register*.

Additional copies of this draft guidance are available from the Office of Communication, Training and Manufacturers Assistance (HFM-40), 1401 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852-1448, or by calling 1-800-835-4709 or 301-827-1800, or from the Internet at <http://www.fda.gov/cber/guidelines.htm>.

For questions on the content of this draft guidance contact the Office of Blood Research and Review at 301-827-6178.

**U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Food and Drug Administration
Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research
January 2005**

Guidance for Industry and FDA Staff

Class II Special Controls Guidance Document: Automated Blood Cell Separator Device Operating by Centrifugal or Filtration Separation Principle

Paperwork Reduction Act Public Burden Statement

According to the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, a collection of information should display a valid Office of Management and Budget (OMB) control number. The valid OMB control number for this information collection is 0910-[xxxx] (Expires [xx/xx/xxxx]). The time required to complete this information collection is estimated to average 20 hours per response, including the time to review instructions, search existing data resources, gather the data needed, and complete and review the information collection. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or suggestions for reducing this burden to:

Food and Drug Administration
Center for Biologics Evaluation and Research (HFM-99)
1401 Rockville Pike
Rockville, MD 20852-1448

An agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

Contains Nonbinding Recommendations

Draft – Not for Implementation

Table of Contents

I. PURPOSE.....	1
II. BACKGROUND	2
III. THE LEAST BURDENSOME APPROACH.....	2
IV. DEVICE DESCRIPTION	3
V. RISKS TO HEALTH.....	3
VI. SPECIAL CONTROLS.....	4
VII. CONCLUSION	5
REFERENCES.....	5

Contains Nonbinding Recommendations

Draft – Not for Implementation

Guidance for Industry and FDA Staff

**Class II Special Controls Guidance Document: Automated
Blood Cell Separator Device Operating by Centrifugal or
Filtration Separation Principle**

This draft guidance, when finalized, will represent the Food and Drug Administration's (FDA's) current thinking on this topic. It does not create or confer any rights for or on any person and does not operate to bind FDA or the public. You can use an alternative approach if the approach satisfies the requirements of the applicable statutes and regulations. If you want to discuss an alternative approach, contact the appropriate FDA staff. If you cannot identify the appropriate FDA staff, call the appropriate number listed on the title page of this guidance.

I. PURPOSE

We, FDA, are issuing this draft guidance document in conjunction with a *Federal Register* proposed rule proposing to reclassify from class III to class II the automated blood cell separator device operating on a centrifugal separation principle intended for the routine collection of blood and blood components. This guidance is issued for comment purposes only. If the final rule does not reclassify this device type, this guidance document will be revised. This document serves as the special control to support the reclassification. Also, this document, when final, will serve as the special control for the automated blood cell separator device operating on a filtration principle intended for the routine collection of blood and blood components reclassified as class II on February 28, 2003 (68 FR 9530). Special controls, when combined with general controls, ordinarily address the risks associated with use of the device.

FDA's guidance documents, including this guidance, do not establish legally enforceable responsibilities. Instead, guidances describe FDA's current thinking on a topic and should be viewed only as recommendations, unless specific regulatory or statutory requirements are cited. The use of the word *should* in FDA's guidances means that something is suggested or recommended, but not required.

Following the effective date of a final rule reclassifying the device, any firm submitting a 510(k) premarket notification for an automated blood cell separator device operating by centrifugal or filtration separation principle intended for the routine collection of blood and blood components will need to address the issues covered in this special control guidance. However, the firm need only show that its device meets the recommendations of this guidance or in some other way provides equivalent assurances of safety and effectiveness.

Contains Nonbinding Recommendations

Draft – Not for Implementation

II. BACKGROUND

FDA believes that special controls, when combined with general controls, will be sufficient to provide reasonable assurance of the safety and effectiveness of the automated blood cell separator device operating on a centrifugal or filtration separation principle and intended for the routine collection of blood and blood components. Thus, a manufacturer that intends to market a device of this generic type should (1) conform to the general controls of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (the Act), including the premarket notification requirements described in 21 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), Part 807, Subpart E, (2) address the specific risks to health associated with the automated blood cell separator device identified in this guidance, and (3) obtain a substantial equivalence determination from FDA prior to marketing the device (see also § 807.85 (21 CFR 807.85)).

This special control guidance identifies the relevant classification regulation, which provides a description of the applicable automated blood cell separator device (refer to section IV. – Device Description, below). In addition, other sections of this special control guidance list the risks to health identified by FDA and describe measures that, if followed by manufacturers and combined with general controls, will ordinarily address the risks associated with these automated blood cell separator devices.

This document supplements the specific content requirements of a premarket notification submission under § 807.87 and other FDA documents on this topic (e.g., **510(k) Manual – Premarket Notification 510(k): Regulatory Requirements for Medical Devices**, August 1995; and, **The New 510(k) Paradigm – Alternate Approaches to Demonstrating Substantial Equivalence in Premarket Notifications; Final Guidance**, March 20, 1998. (See references 1 and 2)). A manufacturer may submit a Traditional 510(k) premarket notification or has the option of submitting either an Abbreviated 510(k) or a Special 510(k) (See *The New 510(k) Paradigm*). We believe an Abbreviated 510(k) provides the least burdensome means of demonstrating substantial equivalence for a new device, particularly once we have issued a special control guidance. Manufacturers considering modifications to their own cleared devices may lessen the regulatory burden by submitting a Special 510(k) (See *The New 510(k) Paradigm* at page 3).

III. THE LEAST BURDENSOME APPROACH

We recommend that you address the following issues identified in this guidance before your device can be marketed. In developing this guidance, we carefully considered the relevant statutory criteria for FDA decision-making. We also considered the burden that may be incurred in your attempt to comply with the statutory and regulatory criteria in a manner suggested by this guidance and in your attempt to address the issues we have identified. We think that we have provided the least burdensome approach to resolving

Contains Nonbinding Recommendations

Draft – Not for Implementation

these issues. If, however, you believe there is a less burdensome way to address the issues, please follow the procedures outlined in the document, *The Least Burdensome Provisions - Activities Related to Implementation* (See reference 3).

IV. DEVICE DESCRIPTION

Title 21, Code of Federal Regulations, § 864.9245 provides the classification for automated blood cell separators. The automated blood cell separator is a device that operates on a centrifugal or a filtration separation principle intended for the routine collection of blood and blood components. The device automatically withdraws whole blood from a donor, separates the whole blood into blood components, collects one or more of the blood components, and returns to the donor the remainder of the whole blood and blood components (apheresis donation). The blood components collected are transfused or used for further manufacture.

This draft guidance applies to automated blood cell separator devices that operate by either centrifugal or filtration separation principles and where the intended use is for the routine collection of blood and blood components. FDA has proposed that these automated blood cell separator devices be classified as class II (special controls).

V. RISKS TO HEALTH

In order to provide assurances for the safe and effective use of the device, we first identify risks to health associated with the device's intended use. Then, we determine if the general and special controls will sufficiently address the identified risks. Presently, we have identified the following risks associated with apheresis blood donation and processing:

- potential loss of blood due to leaks,
- thrombosis due to activation of factors by foreign surfaces,
- moderate-severe toxic reaction to citrate anticoagulant (e.g., tetany, seizures, cardiac arrhythmias),
- damage to red blood cells, activation of complement, and denaturation of proteins,
- potential for sepsis and fever due to bacterial contamination of the donor's blood returned to the donor,
- infectious disease risk to the donor or to the operator due to leaks,
- electrical shock hazard,
- donor stress reaction due to removal or loss of blood,
- air embolism,
- hemolysis, and
- reservoir rupture.

Contains Nonbinding Recommendations

Draft – Not for Implementation

VI. SPECIAL CONTROLS

For currently marketed products not approved under the premarket approval (PMA) process, the manufacturer should file with FDA for three consecutive years an annual report on the anniversary date of the device reclassification from class III to class II, or, on the anniversary date of 510(k) clearance. Any subsequent change to the device requiring the submission of a premarket notification in accordance with section 510(k) of the Act should be included in the annual report. Also, a manufacturer of a device determined to be substantially equivalent to the automated blood cell separator device operating by centrifugal or filtration separation principle intended for the routine collection of blood and blood components, should comply with the same general and special controls.

This draft guidance (special control) recommends that each annual report include, at a minimum, the following information:

1. A summary of anticipated and unanticipated donor adverse device events that have occurred and that are not required to be reported by manufacturers under Medical Device Reporting (MDR).¹ We recommend summarizing and reporting donor adverse device events such as those required under § 606.160(b)(1)(iii)^{2, 3} to be recorded and maintained by the facility⁴ using the device to collect blood and blood components. Under § 803.50(b)(2), manufacturers are responsible for conducting an investigation of each event and evaluating the cause of the event. Therefore, this information should be available to the manufacturer to summarize and provide to FDA in the annual report. We emphasize that safety information submitted to FDA is not to be considered an admission of causation or liability (October 27, 1994, 59 FR 54046 at 54051).

¹ 21 *CFR* § 803.1(a) – “device user facilities, importers, and manufacturers, as defined in § 803.3, must report deaths and serious injuries to which a device has or may have caused or contributed . . . manufacturers and importers are also required to report certain device malfunctions . . .”

² 21 *CFR* § 606.160(b) – “Records shall be maintained that include, but are not limited to, the following when applicable: . . . (1)(iii) Donor adverse reaction complaints and reports, including results of all investigations and followup.”

³ In separate proposed rulemaking (Safety Reporting Requirements for Human Drug and Biological Products; Proposed Rule (68 *FR* 12405, March 14, 2003), FDA has proposed amending 21 *CFR* § 606.170 to require the investigation and recording by blood establishments of any complaint of a serious adverse reaction related to the collection or transfusion of blood or blood components.

⁴ “Facility” means any area used for the collection, processing, compatibility testing, storage or distribution of blood and blood components (21 *CFR* § 606.3(h)). Also, applicable is “device user facility” under § 803.3(f), meaning “a hospital, ambulatory surgical facility, nursing home, outpatient diagnostic facility, or outpatient treatment facility . . .” (Note: The donor becomes a patient when he or she experiences and is treated for an adverse event contributed to or caused by the medical device.)

Contains Nonbinding Recommendations

Draft – Not for Implementation

2. Any subsequent change to the device requiring the submission of a premarket notification in accordance with section 510(k) of the Act (Ref. 4).
3. Any subsequent change to the preamendments class III device requiring a 30-day notice in accordance with § 814.39(f).

MDR reportable events may include operator infection or injury; equipment failures, including software, hardware, and disposable item failures; thrombosis; sepsis; and shock resulting from blood loss. You do not have to include the MDR reports in the annual report. If not reportable under MDR, please refer to 1. above, under this section.

VII. CONCLUSION

This guidance contains recommendations with regard to the reporting of adverse device events that typically are not reported under the MDR regulation. The reporting of adverse device events summarized in an annual report will alert FDA to trends or clusters of events that might be a safety issue otherwise unreported under the MDR regulation. These special controls along with the general controls should provide reasonable assurance of the safety and effectiveness of the device.

REFERENCES

1. 510(k) Manual – *Premarket Notification 510(k): Regulatory Requirements for Medical Devices*, August 1995; <http://www.fda.gov/cdrh/manual/510kp1.html>.
2. *The New 510(k) Paradigm – Alternate Approaches to Demonstrating Substantial Equivalence in Premarket Notifications; Final Guidance*, March 20, 1998; <http://www.fda.gov/cdrh/ode/parad510.html>.
3. *The Least Burdensome Provisions - Activities Related to Implementation*; <http://www.fda.gov/cdrh/modact/leastburdensome.html>.
4. *Guidance - Deciding When to Submit a 510(k) for a Change to an Existing Device*, January 10, 1997; <http://www.fda.gov/cdrh/ode/510kmod.html>.
5. *Guidance for Industry, Recommendations for Collecting Red Blood Cells by Automated Apheresis Methods*, January 2001; Technical Correction February 2001; <http://www.fda.gov/cber/gdlns/rbcautoph2.htm>.
6. *Medical Device Reporting Guidance, Medical Device Reporting for Manufacturers*, March 1997; <http://www.fda.gov/cdrh/manual/mdrman.pdf>.